

REMARKS

All of the claims have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and no new claims have been added. Claims 1-25 are therefore pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

A. Rejection of Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 21 citing Angles and Filepp

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 21 under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Angles (US 5, 933,811) and Filepp (US 5,347,632) . This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 1, 7, 11, 15 and 21 are independent claims. The totality of the limitations recited in each of claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 21 is neither taught nor suggested by the combination of references because, generally, the “client application” as claimed includes features which are neither taught nor suggested in the combination of references.

B. The Functionality of A Client Application and an Internet Browser Are Different

Claim 1 recites a method with a client application having various functionality, including:

“commencing an **initial** online session with the online service provider **to gain access to the Internet**”,

“operating independently of an Internet browser and operating concurrently with the Internet browser”, and

“causing a client window to be displayed on the output device, the client window remaining **fully** visible so long as the online session with the online service provider persists, wherein the client window is displayed independently of a browser window generated by the Internet browser”. (emphasis added)

Neither Filepp nor Angles disclose these limitations. As such, the combination of Filepp and Angles fails to teach a client application that has each and every one of the features recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 7 recites a method with a client application having various functionality, including:

“commencing an online session with the **online service provider**”;

“operating independently of an Internet browser and operating concurrently with the Internet browser”; and

“causing a client window to be displayed on the output device, the client window remaining **fully visible and on top of all other windows** so long as the online session with the online service provider persists, wherein the client window is displayed concurrently with a browser window generated by the Internet browser”. (emphasis added)

Neither Filepp nor Angles disclose these limitations. As such, the combination of Filepp and Angles fails to teach a client application that has each and every one of the features recited in claim 7. Therefore, claim 7 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 11, 15 and 21 have certain limitations in common with claims 1 and/or 7 as shown above. To the extent claims 11, 15 and 21 share limitations with claims 1 and/or 7, claims 11, 15 and 21 are patentable over the cited references for the same reasons claims 1 and/or 7 are patentable over the cited references as shown above.

The dependent claims are patentable over Filepp and Angles by virtue of their dependence on independent claims which have been shown to be patentable above. Therefore, all currently pending claims are patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and

allowance at an early date is solicited. We strongly request that the Examiner review the independent claims and reevaluate the cited prior art in view of the arguments presented above.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to answer any questions and to discuss steps necessary for placing the claims in condition for allowance.

Date: September 20, 2006

SoCal IP Law Group LLP
310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: 805/230-1350 x240
Facsimile: 805/230-1355
mgoldstein@socalip.com

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Andrew Goldstein
Reg. No. 50,759